DE GRUYTER OPEN

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017
DOI 10.2478/vtrr-2018-0003

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO QUALITATIVE METHODS: DECIDING BETWEEN GROUNDED THEORY AND PHENOMENOLOGY FOR YOUR RESEARCH

MASOODI Marjan

Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius, Lithuania

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to compare two qualitative approaches that can be used in different researches: phenomenology and grounded theory. This overview is done to (1) summarize similarities and differences between these two approaches, with attention to their historical development, goals, methods, audience, and products (2) familiarize the researchers with the origins and details of these approaches in the way that they can make better matches between their research question(s) and the goals and products of the study (3) discuss a brief outline of each methodology along with their origin, essence and procedural steps undertaken (4) illustrate how the procedures of data analysis (coding), theoretical memoing and sampling are applied to systematically generate a grounded theory (5) briefly examine the major challenges for utilizing two approaches in grounded theory, the Glaserian and Straussian. As a conclusion, this overview reveals that it is essential to ensure that the method matches the research question being asked, helps the researchers determine the suitability of their applied approach and provides a continues training for the novice researchers, especially PhD or research students who lack solid knowledge and background experience in multiple research methods.

Keywords: Grounded theory; Phenomenology; Research method selection; Research methodology; Qualitative research.

Background

The need for rigorous and relevant research to address the needs of various research fields, suggests more attention be paid towards the research methods selection. In addition, academia, practitioners and industry partners increase the complexity of research demands, objectives and expected results. Furthermore, they tend to look for tangible results that can be

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

easily transferred and applied to practice. Thus, academia must not be neglected in striving for rigor and relevance (Robey& Markus 1998). Rigorous research in particular, can be achieved not only through carefully selecting and applying the research method but also detailing its execution.

Research method selection is dependent on the circumstances and objectives of the research rather than deriving from philosophy (how we think about it) or methodology (how we study it) (Hammersley data, 1999, p.80). Selecting the most appropriate research method must be driven by the research question and current body of knowledge in the area researched as well as the data accessible to the researcher. Unfortunately, researchers are often confronted with an overwhelming number of research methods and regularly struggle to decide on the most suitable one. Each possible method has advantages and disadvantages which need to be taken into account. This reason further highlights the need for a strategy to select the most appropriate research method. Manson (2002, p. 26) suggests the creation of an overview of potential research methods and data sources in the initial research stage including the ones which might be rejected. She further highlighted that by generating data and analyzing data paired with the experience gained by researcher throughout this process the research most appropriate method could be selected. Given the multiple research methods available, choosing the most appropriate research method is not an easy task.

Qualitative research methods enable various sciences researchers to delve into questions of meaning, examine institutional and social practices and processes, identify barriers and facilitators to change, and discover the reasons for the success or failure of interventions. As with all research endeavors, choosing the method that is best suited to the line of inquiry is vital to obtaining the desired results. A judicious choice of method guides the research toward the intended aims and helps ensure that its products are useful and well received. Towards this end, the researchers must be encouraged to undertake qualitative research and grounded theory and phenomenology in particular. However, the use of "grounded theory" is said to be overly generic and confusing regarding alternative epistemological approaches to qualitative research (Jones & Alony, 2011; Suddaby, 2006).

Qualitative research methods, purporting to be based upon philosophical phenomenology, have been inaccurately criticized by Shaun Gallagher (2012) who indiscriminately lumps all such approaches together. Considering the wide variety of qualitative methods whose founders claim their investigation are phenomenological-many of which have been

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

critiqued as inadequately philosophically grounded by phenomenological scientists themselves (e.g. Giorgi, 2010) generalizations like Gallagher's are unsurprising. The many challenges in adopting a phenomenological philosophical approach to their researches are nothing new. In fact, the problems of certain qualitative methods referring to themselves as phenomenological have been a significant issue for those who take the phenomenological tradition to qualitative research seriously. For example, Amedeo Giorgi, recognized as the founder of the descriptive phenomenological approach to qualitative psychology, has consistently and uncompromisingly critiqued approaches to qualitative methods that have not followed phenomenological criteria (for some recent critiques, see, for example, Giorgi 2010). Hence, there are still good reasons for serious developers of qualitative research methods based on phenomenology to continue to build their methodology on solid philosophical grounds. Therefore, one of the purposes of this paper is to take a closer look at what constitutes a phenomenological qualitative. The authors in this research claim that both represent serious and fruitful scientific attempts to qualitative inquiry by remaining faithful to their philosophical foundations. As a line of argument, they believe using phenomenology or grounded theory as your approach depends on the original scientific aim of you as the research developer.

This highlights the need for further guidance and clarification of the methodologies and how they can be applied. As such, the following sections of the paper attempt to provide a useful practical guide that helps understanding not only how to apply grounded theory and phenomenology – as qualitative methodologies- but also how they fit within the overall research design of the research. We begin our analysis with the meaning of qualitative method, then move to a brief comparison of the history of ideas, goals, methods, and products of these two approaches and their potential values. This paper there after finalizes with conclusion and outlook for future research.

Qualitative method

More recently, this invitation has been echoed in the call for qualitative research to play a more central role in different types of studies both internationally and nationally (Stead et al., 2011). A possible reason for this is that qualitative research provides insights that are difficult to produce with quantitative methods. Particularly in the research, qualitative studies may have optimal results due to the following factors: (1) providing nuanced data, which cannot be obtained through quantitative means; (2) delivering depth in data that ensures credibility in results,

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

regardless of small sample sizes; (3) using less resources; (4) providing a voice for the participants in marginalized contexts and from less driven, preconceived research theories and literature; and (5) highlighting the complexities of the phenomenon (Stead et al., 2011).

Qualitative research seeks to describe, explore, understand and explain phenomena through methods of inquiry that elicit qualitative, non-numerical data. Qualitative methods are particularly useful in generating in-depth information that would be difficult to quantify, such as meanings, understandings and experiences. They use a different lens and armoury of techniques to explore phenomena, seeking to observe, question and understand, through interacting with research participants or observing them in their natural environment:

Qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denizin & Lincoln, 2005, p.3)

Qualitative methods can be used to inform quantitative studies, clinical trials and the development and evaluation of complex interventions (MRC, 2008). Qualitative methods can also be used to interpret the findings of an evaluation, for example in determining how and why an intervention is effective or not and the processes underlying its effects on outcomes (its active ingredients and mechanism (s) of actions), ensuring effective implementation in practice. However, historically many studies have taken a tokenistic approach to the inclusion of qualitative components within trials, and qualitative findings have been poorly integrated in data analysis (O'Cathain, 2013). Fully embedded qualitative components have the potential to improve the quality and appropriateness of an intervention, ensure appropriate outcomes are measured and increase a trial's viability, feasibility and likelihood of success (O' Cathain, 2013).

To understand different approaches to qualitative research, it is helpful to consider the schools of thought (paradigms) from which they evolved. As a researcher, your paradigm represents how you view the world and what you believe it is possible to know about the world (ontology). It is also shaped by how you believe it is possible to know something and your relationship to that knowledge (epistemology), including whether the world is independent of, or affected by, the research you conduct (Guba& Lincoln, 2005). Your research paradigm is therefore intimately related to the principles that guide your chosen research practice. Social constructivism endorses the view that, at least in the social world, there are multiple realities that are socially constructed and dependent on shared meanings and understandings (Guba& Lincoln, 2005). That

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

being said, qualitative researchers in general do share some core beliefs: for example, that the social world is inherently complex, multi-faceted and experienced in diverse ways by different individuals; that social context is always relevant and should be taken into account throughout the research process; and that the researcher is an intrinsic component of the research process and hence shapes the product of research.conclusion. In conclusion, based on the analysis of the findings, chef instructors prefer to use a combination of teaching methods in the SSVE for culinary arts students. The design and delivery of lectures, enhanced with students' interaction and active involvement, tend to be an effective and highly used teaching approach. This could improve the essential student-centric character of the learning process in order to maintain and attract the students' interest during the class.

Definition, origin and essence of phenomenology

A phenomenological study describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). Phenomenological inquiry holds the assumption that there is an essence or essences to shared experience (Patton, 2002). In phenomenology, researchers have outlined specific, structured methods of analysis (Moustakas, 1994; Creswell, 2007). Creswell (2007) determines the outlines the procedural steps in phenomenology as determining approach, determining phenomenon, recognizing philosophical assumptions, specifying individuals who have experienced the phenomenon, collecting the data, analyzing the data, writing description of participants' experiences and writing composite or "essence" of the phenomenon respectively.

Phenomenology is a qualitative research design which as Creswell (2007) stated "The basic purpose of phenomenology is to reduce individual experiences with a phenomenon to a description of the universal essence" (p.58). Phenomenology focuses on the description of the shared experiences of the research participants (Creswell, 2013). If for an example a scholar practitioner was requested to analyze an organization that was accused of forms of bias, the phenomenological approach would require the researcher to bracket themselves out of the of the study and to discuss their personal experience, if any, with the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 2013). In the case of organizational bias against employees, this approach would allow the researcher to see the issue from both perspectives of the organizational disagreement to discover shared experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2013).

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

About origins of phenomenology, the Oxford English Dictionary notes the term phenomenology was mentioned as early as 1797 in the Encyclopedia Britannica entry on philosophy. Early twentieth century phenomenological research continued to have strong philosophical underpinnings, drawing from philosophy, psychology, and education, based on the writings of the German mathematician Edmund Husserl, 1859-1938 (Creswell, 2007). In 2015 the Oxford English Dictionary defines phenomenology as:

A method or procedure, originally developed by the German philosopher Edmund Husserl (1859–1938), which involves the setting aside of presuppositions about a phenomenon as an empirical object and about the mental acts concerned with experiencing it, in order to achieve an intuition of its pure essence; the characteristic theories underlying or resulting from the use of such a method. In more recent use: any of various philosophical methods or theories (often influenced by the work of Husserl and his followers) which emphasize the importance of analyzing the structure of conscious subjective experience. In 1928, Husserl wrote an invited article on phenomenology for the fourteenth edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, where he hoped to explain what "his new phenomenology was all about". Husserl, with influence of Descartes, developed the concept of Epoche, which "requires the elimination of suppositions and the raising of knowledge above every possible doubt" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 26). Both Descartes and Husserl "recognized the crucial value of returning to the self to discover the nature and meaning of things as they appear and in their essence" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 26). While Husserl's ideas were considered abstract during his life, and different philosophical arguments for the use of phenomenology have been made since his death in 1938, the philosophical arguments themselves rest on common ground: the study of lived experiences (Creswell, 2007), that the experiences are conscious experiences, and the development of descriptions, not explanations or analyses, of the essences of these experiences (Creswell, 2007). He emphasizes four philosophical perspectives of phenomenology: return to traditional tasks of philosophy, a philosophy without presuppositions, the intentionality of consciousness, and the refusal of the subject-object dichotomy (Creswell, 2007). Today, phenomenology is popular in social, human, and health science disciplines, including nursing, sociology, education, and psychology (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). A phenomenological study describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007).

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

Grounded Theory, its essence and two main approaches

Grounded theory is a powerful and rigorous theory building methodology that has attracted considerable interest in research; however, it is a challenging endeavour especially for novice researchers and in particular at the doctoral level. Although several researchers have attempted to clarify the cannons of various grounded theory approaches, still there is a shortage in guidance for doctoral students who wish to apply grounded theory for their studies.

The primary strength of grounded theory qualitative research is to discover, develop or generate a theory from the observation and data collection from the research participants (Creswell, 2013). This approach eschews the idea that there are ready-made theories that are applied to each unique business problem or situation (Creswell, 2013).

Grounded theory allows the scholar practitioner uses theoretical sampling and compares the data drawn from the research participants, which creates emergent categories, of constant comparative method of data analysis (Creswell, 2013). This allows the research to create new theories that apply and are applicable to the business under analysis, as the theory, was in part developed by the participants themselves.

Grounded Theory was first developed by two sociologists, Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss in 1967 as an action against the extreme positivism that had permeated most social research. Glaser & Strauss (1967) argued that researchers needed a method that would allow them to move from data to theory, so that new theories could emerge. Such theories would be specific to the context in which they had been developed and 'grounded' in the data from which they had emerged, i.e., substantive theory. That said, the substantive theory developed can be subsequently compared with existing more formal theories as advocated by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and as such linked to the existing body of knowledge. It is through this comparison with existing formal theories a substantive theory may "become a spring-board or stepping stone to the development of a grounded formal theory" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 79). The aim of grounded theory is to understand "how social circumstances could account for the interactions, behaviours and experiences of the people being studied". Grounded theory is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic collection and analysis of data pertaining to a particular phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Before, we illustrate the application of grounded theory, it must be noted that there are two main approaches that have emerged since the original grounded theory was introduced

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

(Graham & Thomas, 2008). These are the Glaserian and Straussian grounded theory approaches. The former is the extension of the original grounded theory approach by Glaser (1992) while the latter is the 'full conceptual description' approach advanced by Strauss & Corbin. Here, the description emphasises a more detail explanation of concepts such as theoretical sampling, theoretical coding, and use of theoretical memos in generating grounded theory. Glaser is viewed as remaining more faithful to the original version of grounded theory in his approach to data analysis, while Strauss (with Corbin) is considered to have reformulated the original version (Glaser, 1992). While Glaser (1992) emphasized the "interpretive nature of theory development", primarily using constant comparison method, Strauss (with Corbin) focused on a systematic coding techniques incorporating analytical techniques. Thus, the differences between the two approaches have focused on methodological procedures for coding data and developing categories, emergence, researcher distance, and theory development (Graham & Thomas, 2008). Although the Strauss & Corbin (1998) data analysis process was criticised for being "programmatic and over formulaic and rigid", the critics admit that the suggested guidelines and procedures allow greater latitude for ingenuity and are an aid to creativity (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Below in Table 1, some of the key differences between these two main stands of ground theory have been categorized.

Table 1. *Differences between Glaserian and Straussian Grounded Theory*

Element	Classic/ Glaserian Grounded Theory	Straussian Grounded Theory
Research Question	Should not be defined a priori, but emerge from the research—this makes the RQ relevant to the field. The researcher starts with an 'area of interest.' Literature in other areas may be consulted to increase the researcher's "theoretical sensitivity." Defining a RQ a priori is considered "forcing" (Glaser, 1992).	Research question may be defined upfront, derived from the literature or suggested by a colleague; RQ is often broad and open-ended
Role of Literature	An extensive literature review should be delayed until after the theory is emerging to prevent the influence of existing concepts on the emerging theory. Until the researcher has defined the RQ, it is not clear which literature should be consulted. Existing concepts such as gender and age should not be included a priori, but must 'earn' their way into the emerging theory.	The literature may be consulted throughout the process, as concepts from the literature may be used if applicable; to enhance theoretical sensitivity, as a secondary data source; to formulate questions for data collection or stimulate questions during analysis; to suggest areas for theoretical sampling (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 49).

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

Coding Procedure	Open coding: 'fracturing' of the data; line by line coding is recommended to achieve full theoretical coverage, but does not reject coding sentences or paragraphs, or whole documents (Glaser, 1992). Selective coding: delimiting coding to only those variables that relate to one (or in some cases, several) core variables to establish a parsimonious theory. The core variable guides further data collection. Theoretical coding: establishing conceptual relations between substantive codes, resulting in the development of hypotheses. Glaser proposes several 'coding families,' which are theoretical codes that can be used by researchers, though these must 'earn' their way into the emerging theory.	Open coding: generation of 'categories' and how they vary dimensionally. Coding can be done line by line or by sentence or paragraph, or even the whole document (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Axial coding: putting back data in new ways after open coding by identifying relationships between categories; this is effectively Glaser's theoretical coding. Use of the 'paradigm model' or 'conditional matrix' (an analytical tool in Straussian GT (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, Ch. 12) to identify context, conditions, action / interaction strategies and consequences. Selective coding: deciding on the central category that all major categories can link to (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).
Questions asked during Analysis	• What is this data a study of? • What category or what property of what category does this incident indicate? • What is actually happening in the data? (Glaser, 1992).	Asking questions about whom, when, where, how, with what consequences, and under what conditions phenomena occur, helps to 'discover' important ideas for the theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). 'Freewheeling flights of imagination'.
Philosophical Influences	Objectivism: There exists a single, correct description of reality; the researcher therefore discovers grounded theory from data (Bryant and Charmaz, 2007).	Pragmatism and symbolic interactionism: actors engage in a world that requires reflexive interaction; reality is constructed through interaction and relies on language and communication (Chamberlain-Salaun, Mills and Usher, 2013).
Evaluation Criteria	The generated categories must fit the data, the theory should work (it must be able to explain or predict what will happen); the theory must have relevance to the action of the area, and the theory must be modifiable as new data appear (Glaser, 1992, p. 4-5).	Seven criteria for the research process e.g. information on sample selection, major categories, derived hypotheses and discrepancies. Eight criteria regarding the empirical grounding, e.g. "are concepts generated?" "is variation built into the theory?" (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

Similarities and differences

Phenomenological research originated with the American Psychologist, William James in the 19th century, requires the researcher to suspend their own cognitive bias of a shared experience of the research individuals (Fay & Montague, 2015). The researcher should attempt to

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

understand the experience of the research participants, as they, the individuals in the study, perceive the phenomenon, without their own cognitive bias altering the data (Creswell, 2013).

Grounded theory research focuses on the common experiences, versus the phenomenological shares stories of the research participants (Creswell, 2013). The researcher using this approach, attempts to discover a new emergent theory generated by the shared experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2013). This methodology allies with Gestalt psychological theory, where individuals tries to make sense and order from chaotic world (Ali & Peebles, 2013). The researcher creates or generates the theory or a new theoretical framework altogether from the shared group consensual version of reality (Creswell, 2013).

Stark and Trinidad (2007) have depicted the similarities and differences across the two interpretive approaches in table 2. Phenomenology and grounded theory are the products of different intellectual traditions. However, their coevolution in the history of ideas means that the boundaries between them are porous. They have provided a brief summary of the intellectual lineage and basic value commitments of phenomenology and grounded theory with respect to history, goal, philosophy, methodology, analytic method and product of both approaches.

Table 2. *Similarities and Differences of two Interpretive Approaches with Respect to History, Goal, Philosophy, Methodology, Analytic Method and Product by Stark& Trinidad (2007)*

	Phenomenology	**Grounded Theory**
History	European Philosophy	Sociology
Philosophy	There exists an essential perceived reality with common features.	Theory is discovered by examining concepts grounded in the data
Goal	Describe the meaning of the lived experience of a phenomenon	Develop an explanatory theory of basic social processes
Methodology (formulating a research question)	What is the lived experience of the phenomenon of interest?	How does the basic social process of X happen in the context of Y environment?
Sampling	Those who have experienced the phenomenon of interest	Those who have experience the phenomenon under different conditions
Data Collection: Observation	Observe participants in the context where the phenomenon is experienced	Observed participants where the basic social process takes place
Interviewing Strategy	Participant describes experience, interviewer probes for detail, clarity	Participant describes experience, interviewer probes for detail, clarity
Analytic Methods (Decontextualization & recontextualization: Process of coding, sorting,	Identify descriptions of the phenomenon; cluster into discrete categories; taken together, these describe the "essence" or core commonality and structure of the experience	Open, axial and selective coding: examine concepts across their properties and dimension; develop an explanatory framework that integrates

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

identifying themes and relationships, and drawing conclusions)		into a core category
Role of Analyst's Views	Bracket views	Bracket views
Audience	Clinicians, practitioners& others who need to understand the lived experience of the phenomenon of interest	Researchers and practitioners who seek explanatory models upon which to design intervention
Product	A thematic description of the pre-given "essence" and structures of lived experiences	Generate theory from the range of the participants' experience

Grounded theory and phenomenology are both inductive and their initial steps are almost identical. For example the mode of data generation and design of interview questions is fairly similar for both research methods in the early stage, with the core issue being the generation of rich and faithful data. The objectives of data analysis are different, even though marginal in the initial phase. Ground theory aims to enquire and state how actors interpret reality, rather than testing hypotheses (Suddaby, 2006) and is thereby more attentive to how theory emerges from subjective experience. Phenomenology on the other side is more concerned about the individual's experience (Suddaby, 2006; Patton, 2002, p.104). Table 3 gives an indication of criteria against which ground theory and phenomenology were compared by some researchers.

Table 3. *Comparing of two methods by some researchers*

What	Grounded Theory	Phenomenology
Research question	"What theory emerges from systematic comparative analysis is grounded in fieldwork so as to explain what has been and is observed?" (Patton 2002, p. 133)	"What is the meaning, structure, and essence of the lived experience of this phenomenon for this person or group of people?" (Patton, 2002, p. 132)
Representation of findings	Theory about …(Morse& Richards, 2002, p. 36)	In-depth reflective description of the (experience)…(Morse& Richards, 2002, p. 36)
Data generation	Interviews, observing social interactions by listening to what informants say about themselves and others. The selection of participants and other data sources is a function of emerging hypotheses, the sample size a function of theoretical completeness (Baker, Wuest& Stern, 1992)	In-depth, unstructured lengthy interviews which are more similar to a conversation rather than a typical interview talking the interviewee and listening the researcher (Leedy& Ormrod, 2005, p.139). The interviewee and the researcher often work together during the interview "arrive at the heart of the matter" (Tesch, 1990, p. 147).
Data analysis	Prescribed and systematic method of coding the data into categories and identifying interrelationships; continual interweaving of	Search for "meaning of units" that reflect various aspects of the experience; integration of the meaning units into a "typical" experience (Leedy& Ormrod, 2005, p.144)

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

	data generation and data analysis; construction of a theory from categories and interrelationships (Leedy& Ormrod, 2005, p.144)	
Literature review	Not extensive literature review prior to the study "only" after theory is emerging from the data. But grounded theory is no excuse to ignore literature (Suddaby, 2006)	Review of professional and research literature to prepare for the study. The focus is thereby prior relevant studies; distinguishes their design, methodologies and findings (Moustakes , 1994, p. 111)
Background of the researcher	Experience in the field can be an advantage, however, it has to be distinguished between knowledge and influencing an interviewee through knowledge during generation (Fendt& Sachs, 2008)	The researcher can have personal experience in the phenomenon of investigation, while broadening his own understanding by the experience of others the researcher can generalize from a insider perspective "what something is like" (Leedy& Ormrod, 2005, p.144).

Semi-structured interviews are for both grounded theory and phenomenology the most common mode of data generation. Phenomenological interviewing tends to be dialogical, rather than observational, the meaning of lived experience is a result of co-creation between the researcher and the researched. In difference to grounded theory, where the first instance of interviewing aims to recount the interviewee's experience (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, pp. 75-76), while subsequent interviews during theoretical sampling will be more focused and tailored to the emerging theory. No matter what stage of research both methods of phenomenology and grounded theory require interview questions, which do not impose any view of the phenomenon under investigation to the interviewee. Special emphasis was firstly put on not biasing the interviewee. The researcher's role is thereby seen as "distant expert" (Glaser, 1992) or "co-producer" for grounded theory, while for phenomenology researchers are supposed to suspend any preconceived notions as well as personal experiences called "bracketing". Secondly, when conducting interviews, attention is paid to changes through rewording and re-sequencing of questions during the interview as this can lead to problems when comparing responses (Patton, 2002, p. 349).

Everything is data to the ground theorist, allowing the flexibility of utilizing different data sources. Phenomenology on the other hand concentrates on having interviewees, which experienced the effects and their interactions on global projects as only legitimate source of data (Baker, Wuest& Stern, 1992). The strength of grounded theory is the combination of the depth of inquiry and the unimpaired interplay of theoretical and empirical data (Gibson, Gregory& Robinson, 2005). Generally, interviewees provide additional direct (project documentations and reports) and indirect data (references) next to the data gathered through semi-structured interviews.

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

This appears to benefit the grounded theory method, which infers from listening, observations, readings or ones past experiences (Baker, Wuest & Stern 1992).

The sampling can suggest if we should apply grounded theory or phenomenology. Having multiple interviewees supports the argument of "the selection of participants and other data sources is, therefore, a function of emerging hypotheses and the sample size, a function of theoretical completeness" (Baker, Wuest & Stern, 1992). This is in contrast to the phenomenology method where the sample size is kept on purpose small. Moreover, the requirement of phenomenology joint collaboration and repeated interviews over time appeared to be not feasible due to time and access limitations.

During the data analysis, the circumstance that grounded theory provides clear guidelines for both the conduct of research and interpretation of the results is very helpful for a novice researcher. In fact, grounded theory does not rely on descriptive accounts compared to phenomenology and it is more flexible (Fendt& Sachs, 2008).

In grounded theory, we have the approach of constant comparison, development of emerging themes followed by purposeful data generation for theoretical sampling. It aims to answer the "what" questions in the explorative theory development phase and the "how" questions in the theory refinement phase (Morse& Richards 2002, p. 36).

The utilization of computer-assisted qualitative software (CAQDAS) provides invaluable assistance to capture, safe and compare data in comparison to the "old-fashioned" and manual way of cards and post-its or multiple spreadsheets. This is due to the fact that both methods of phenomenology and grounded theory can be easily compared and contrasted. In addition, this software allows multiple coders' ensuring intercoder reliability, which is another benefit.

Researchers often refer to phenomenology as the method, whereas to refer to grounded theory as the method could hide the multiple approach to data collection. It would appear that the predominant method of data collection in phenomenology is the (in-depth) interview. This can be contrasted with data collection in grounded theory studies for which the interview may only be one of multiple methods used. Baker et al. (1992) also conclude that it is imperative that the chosen method is congruent with the research question. Although it may be considered that the research question itself should be congruent with the methodology, it is sometimes difficult to see such congruence with regard to the method of data collection. What appears to be happening is that the interview is used as a generic method without consideration of how it is to be used in the

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

particular methodology. The result is that the interview process is often discussed inappropriately within the methodological paradigm from which it should originate. There is a core of work on interviewing that is common to the method irrespective of methodology (Fontana & Frey 1998). There is also a point however, at which interviewing in grounded theory and interviewing in phenomenology appear to diverge. The phenomenologist remains centered on eliciting the experience of respondents so that the phenomenon can be revealed. The grounded theorist, after an initial phenomenological approach, is then seeking to develop the emerging theory and may move on to other data collection methods, or structured interviews, to saturate emerging categories.

The focus for the grounded theory approach is to develop a theory grounded in the data discovered. As in a phenomenological study, interviews are the primary method of data collection and all participants in the study will have similar experiences, but unlike phenomenology, in grounded theory the researcher develops a theory of the experience based on the data gathered from a large number of participants (Creswell, 2007). He categorized the below similarities and differences between these two methods in tradition, its type, unit, origin discipline and purpose on the following Table 4.

Table 4. *Qualitative Research Traditions Adapted from Creswll, J. W. (2007)*

Tradition	Types of Tradition	Unit	Origin Discipline (s)	Purpose
Phenomenology	Hermeneutical, transcendental. Describing what all participants have in common as they experience a phenomenon	Several individuals	Psychology and philosophy	To understand the essence of the experience
Grounded Theory	Systematic, constructivist. To generate or discover a theory	Several individuals' experiences	Sociology	To develop a theory grounded in data from the field

Limitation(s) and further research

The intent of qualitative research is to explain, describe, and interpret in depth (MAXWELL, 2013). Thus, the discussion of limitations should focus on whether the researcher achieved the intended depth rather than generalizability.

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

The researchers should be trained with academic and professional perspectives and should have deep experience in coping with individuals and organizations from multiple and diverse cultural settings. He also should have the skill in interviewing and know how to interact with interviewee or different modes of interview conduct e.g. in-person, telephone or video and its appropriateness.

Philosophical positions, selection of multiple research methods, and combination of multiple paradigms can be considered for further future work.

The results indicate a clear need for increased exposure to qualitative methodology, both by publishing more qualitative studies in local journals and by providing formal training opportunities. A publication does not solely rely on authorship, but also on a review process. Therefore certain adjustments in this process may lead to more and better qualitative publications in future.

Conclusions

The information on this paper can support researchers to identify and apply the most appropriate method, grounded theory or phenomenology, for data analysis. The objective is thereby to drive faithful and relevant results from the data collected in a rigorous, repeatable and traceable manner. Novice researchers, especially PhD or research students in their initial stage, which often do not have a solid knowledge and background experience in multiple research methods as well as their selection will benefit from this paper. This article is the product of our struggles to learn how to choose the most appropriate method for a particular qualitative research project. This side-by-side comparison between grounded theory and phenomenology is intended to help researchers become familiar with the origins, history of ideas, and embedded assumptions of these approaches and, thus, empower them to make better matches between their research question(s), audience, and the goals and products of the study.

By considering methodological development over time, it helps to improve qualitative scholars' understanding of the predominant profile and trends of qualitative studies, and provides a range of methodological possibilities within the realm of qualitative inquiry. As a result, such a review may also strengthen methodological sophistication and encourage innovation among qualitative scholars.

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

10.1515/vtrr-2017-0003 Vocational Training: Research and Realities, Vol 28, No. 1, 2017

In line with the objectives set out in the present study, the findings showed some similarities between two methods such as data generation and design of interview questions, inductiveness, using semi-structured interviews, having unbiasing interviewee and usefulness of utilization of computer-assisted qualitative software (CAQDAS).

Some of the differences based on this overview can categorized as following: 1) Grounded research focuses on the common experiences, versus the phenomenological shared stories of participants. 2) Everything is data to the ground theorist while phenomenology on concentrates on having interviewees. 3) Having multiple interviewees for having different data sources in grounded theory is in contrast to the phenomenology method where the sample size is kept on purpose small. 4) Grounded theory does not rely on descriptive accounts compared to phenomenology. 5) In grounded theory, we have the approach of constant comparison and answer the “what” questions in the explorative theory development phase and the “how” questions in the theory refinement phase. 6) The predominant method of data collection in phenomenology is the (in-depth) interview while in grounded theory studies the interview may only be one of multiple methods used. Simply, when considering sampling, researchers need to move beyond "how many?" to address the questions of "how?" and "why?" Having more than one version of grounded theory, it is quite important that doctoral students state and justify in their theses which version has been used and why. A combination of phenomenology and grounded theory as suggested by Annells (2006) can be considered sometimes. However limitations in terms of time and resources raise constraints of feasibility. In addition a multi-method approach will not ensure a higher accuracy and relevance of results.

References

1. Ali, N., & Peebles, D. (2013). The effect of Gestalt laws of perceptual organization on the Comprehension of three-variable bar and line graphs. *Human Factors*, 55(1), 183-203.
2. Annells, M. (2006). Triangulation of qualitative approaches: hermeneutical phenomenology and grounded theory. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 56(1), 55-61.
3. Baker, C., Wuest, J., & Stern, P.N. (1992). Method slurring: the grounded theory/phenomenology example. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 17, 1335-1360.
4. Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (2007). *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

5. Chamberlain-Salaun, J., Mills, J., & Usher, K. (2013). Linking symbolic interactionism and grounded theory methods in a research design. From *Corbin and Strauss' Assumptions to Action*. SAGE Open, pp. 3, 3, 1-10.
6. Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
7. Creswell, J. W. (2007*). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
8. Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry Research Design, Choosing Among Five Approaches.* Los Angeles: Sage.
9. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed) (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
10. Fay, R. G., & Montague, N. R. (2015). Witnessing Your Own Cognitive Bias: A Compendium of Classroom Exercises. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 30(1),13-34. doi:10.2308/iace-50919
11. Fendt, J., & Sachs, W. (2008). Grounded Theory in Management Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(33), 430-455.
12. Fontana A., & Frey J.H. (1998). *Interviewing: the art of science. In Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (Denzin N.K. & Lincoln Y.S. eds). (pp. 47-78). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
13. Gallagher, S. (2012). Taking stock of phenomenology futures. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 50(2), 304-318.
14. Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence versus forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
15. Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research* (pp. 41-47). Chicago: Aldine.
16. Gibson, B., Gregory, J., & Robinson, P. G. (2005). The intersection between systems theory and grounded theory: The emergence of the grounded systems observer. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 1(2), 1-10.
17. Giorgi, A. (2010). Phenomenology and the practice of science. *Existential Analysis*, 21(1), 3-22.
18. Graham, G., & Thomas, K. (2008). *Building knowledge: Developing a grounded theory of knowledge management for construction* (pp. 116). Waterford Institute of Technology.
19. Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In: Denzin N., Lincoln Y. (eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
20. Hammersley, M. (1999). Deconstruction the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide. *Qualitative Research*, 1, 70-83
21. Jones, M., & Alony, I. (2011). Guiding the use of grounded theory in doctoral studies – An example from the Australian film industry. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 6, 95-114.
22. Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. (8th ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM

23. Manson, L. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage Publications Ltd.
24. Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
25. Morse, J. M., & Richards, L. (2002). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publication.
26. Moustakis C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousands Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications.
27. *MRC.* (2008). Developing and Evaluating Complex Interventions: New Guidance. Medical Research Council.
28. O'Cathain, A., Thomas K.J., Drabble, S.J., Rudolph, A., Hewison, J. (2013). What can qualitative research do for randomised controlled trials? A systematic mapping review. *BMJ Open*, 3: e002889. Available at: http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/bmjopen/3/6/e002889.full.pdf
29. Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
30. Robey, D., & Markus, M. L. (1998). Beyond rigor and relevance: producing consumable research about information system. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 11(1), 7-15.
31. Starks, H., & Trinidad, S. B. (2007). Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1372-1380.
32. Stead, G.B., Perry, J.C., Munka, L.M., Bonnett, H.R., Shiban, A.P., & Care, E. (2011). Qualitative research in career development: Content analysis from 1990 to 2009. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 12(2), 105–122.
33. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
34. Suddaby, R. (2006). From the editors: What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 633-642.
35. Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tool*. New York, NY, USA: Falmer.

Brought to you by | Vytautas Magnus University
Authenticated
Download Date | 4/27/18 8:50 AM